

[29th January 1929]

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—“ It is said here : ‘ The Commissioner of Police saw no reason to expect that Mr. White will again misuse the weapon.’ May I know what were the facts on which the Commissioner of Police satisfied himself that Mr. White would not misuse it ? ”

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—“ The judgment of the Second Presidency Magistrate.”

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—“ Do not the Government consider that shooting a man to death is a sufficient cause for suspending or revoking the licence ? ”

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—“ That is not the question before the House.”

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—“ May I know if the judgment contained any reference to the character of Mr. White and whether the judgment said that he would not misuse the weapon ? ”

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—“ As I have said before, the Second Presidency Magistrate who tried him ordered that the weapon should be returned to him.”

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—“ May I know whether the Government called for and perused the records ? ”

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—“ The Government have perused the records and they do not intend to interfere.”

### Police

#### *Enquiry into the quadruple murder by Kalidindi Bangar Razu of Pedapulleru.*

\* 1141 Q.—Mr. ABDUL WAHAB SAHIB : With reference to the answer to question 434 answered on 26th August 1925 about the alleged quadruple murder committed on 9th November 1923 by one Kalidindi Bangar Razu of Pedapulleru, Bhimavaram taluk, West Godavari district, will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received the report called for and when;

(b) what does the report disclose ;

(c) what steps were taken by the Government to trace the murderer Kalidindi Bangar Razu ;

(d) what steps were taken by the Government in respect of the movables and outstandings due to the family of Bangar Razu ;

(e) whether it was brought to the notice of the Government that some of the assets due to the murderer are being collected and misappropriated by some of his relatives in spite of the prohibitory order issued by the Government in the year 1925 ; if so, what steps were taken by the Government to preserve the assets intact ;

(f) whether the Government was aware of the fact that no action was taken in respect of the movables of the murderer and that the prohibitory order was only in respect of the debts due to Bangar Razu ;

(g) why a Receiver was not appointed by the Government for the purpose of collecting the outstandings due to the murderer and for preserving them, or, in the alternative, why the interests of the murderer in those outstandings were not sold in public auction ;

29th January 1929]

(h) whether it was brought to the notice of the Government that some of the relatives of the murderer have been trying to shield him from being booked and causing disappearance of evidence which lead to his detection ;

(i) what action was taken by the Government against those persons who have been assisting the murderer from detection and for causing disappearance of evidence ; and

(j) why a Special Officer has not been appointed by the Government to enquire into this quadruple murder which resulted in the extirpation of one whole family and to take such necessary steps to trace the murderer and the persons who have been actively aiding to shield him from being booked ?

A.—(a) & (b) The hon. Member is referred to the answer given to Question No. 1098 on the 16th December 1925.

(c) See answer to (a) above. All possible efforts have been made to trace the murderer, Kalidindi Bangar Razu. The police still continue to be on the alert for any clue that may lead to his arrest.

(d), (f) & (g) The movables and the outstandings of the accused consist of a share in a cart, debts due and grain. The cart was attached and kept in the possession of the Village Magistrate of Pedapulleru. The grain was attached but was released on claim petitions from others. His share in the debts due, viz., half, was attached and orders prohibiting payment to any one but the Government were issued under section 88 (3), Criminal Procedure Code. Half the share in the immovable property was placed under attachment, half of which (one-fourth share of the entire property) was sold for Rs. 16,760 subject to the condition that the purchasers should make their own arrangements through Civil Court or otherwise to obtain possession of the shares, while the remaining half was retained under attachment as it was expected that the minor son of the accused would file a suit in respect of the one-fourth property already sold.

Against the order of attachment of debts, the minor's guardian filed a claim petition. A suit was also filed in the Sub-Court at Ellore against the attachment order and sale of the properties. A petition was filed in the High Court to restrain further action by Government. The claim petition is pending. The suit was disposed of favourably, to Government, but the minor's guardian preferred an appeal to the High Court which is pending. The claim petition will be taken up by the Court when the suit is disposed of. Until the claim petition is disposed of the Government cannot take any further action.

(e) Such allegations have been made. If debtors paid to the relatives of the accused in spite of the prohibitory order, they do so at their own risk.

(h) & (i) Evidence in the case against Bangar Razu has already been recorded under section 512, Criminal Procedure Code, and the Court has been asked to keep the connected records in safe custody. Legal opinion is that unless an offence itself is



[29th January 1929]

proved action under section 214, Indian Penal Code, cannot be taken against those who screen the accused from discovery or who tamper with witnesses.

- (j) The case has already been fully investigated and charged. The deputation of a special officer to enquire into it is unnecessary.

### **Economic condition.**

*Improvement of the economic condition of the backward classes in Madura and other districts.*

\* 1142 Q.—MR. S. N. DORAI RAJA: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased—

(a) to call for and lay on the table village economic survey statements in typical backward areas prepared by the resettlement staff of Madura, Ramnad, Trichinopoly, Tanjore and South Arcot districts; and

(b) to state what special steps have been taken by the Transferred and Reserved half of Government to improve the taxable capacity and economic condition of all poor thirty-rupee pattadars?

A.—(a) The Government do not propose to call for and lay on the table the statements referred to by the hon. Member.

- (b) The Government do not make any distinction between thirty-rupee pattadars and others in the matter of any assistance or advice given by them and so no special steps have been taken by them for thirty-rupee pattadars. The activities of the Agricultural and Co-operative departments have a direct bearing on the improvement of the economic condition of the ryots. The activities of the Industrial Engineering section are of direct benefit to the agriculturists. The survey of cottage industries has also been initiated with a view, among other things, to devise measures for the introduction of part-time occupations for the agriculturists in the off season.

MR. R. NAGAN GOWDA: "May I know why the Government do not propose to call for those statements?"

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS: "Before 1917, there were no such statements prepared by the resettlement staff. After that year, in accordance with the recommendations of this House, statements were prepared recording the economic condition of a few families in a few villages, although Government in ordering that preparation as an experimental measure were not sure that they would get any results of value thereby. The statements do not refer to backward areas as the question does, and it was thought that the expenditure incurred in printing and publishing them would not be proportionate to their possible value. That is the reason why we do not propose to publish them."

### **Irrigation**

*Constitution of Irrigation panchayats in Bhimavaram taluk, West Godavari.*

\* 1143 Q.—MR. D. NARAYANA RAJU: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) how many Irrigation panchayats have been constituted in Bhimavaram taluk, West Godavari district; and